DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 780 HE 033 908

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Indicators of Employment. Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol. |
| REPORT NO | HEFCE-01-21 |
| PUB DATE | 2001-04-00 |
| NOTE | 44p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Higher Education Funding Council for England, Northavon House, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, BS16 1QD, England; Tel: 0117-931-7317; Fax: 0117-931-7203; Web site: http://www.hefce.ac.uk. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Graduates; *Employment Patterns; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Outcomes of Education; Performance Factors |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Educational Indicators; *England |

ABSTRACT

This document contains the first set of performance indicators about the employment outcomes of higher education in England. Indicators for other areas had previously been developed, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer requested that indicators showing performance outcomes be developed. The only data available for such an indicator were found to be unsuitable, and it was agreed that the survey used, the First Destination Return, should be amended. Amendments were made for the survey of students graduating in the 1999-2000 academic year, and it is this information that bas been used to provide the indicators in this document. This initial publication only covers graduates qualifying with first degrees who have studied full-time. Two indicators of employment outcomes have been produced. The first expresses the number of graduates who say they are in employment or in further study or training as a percentage of all those who are employed, studying, or unemployed. The second indicator only includes graduates who say they are employed or seeking employment. The indicator is the percentage of this group who are in employment. These indicators and their benchmarks are designed to show how successful graduates from an institution are at obtaining employment or further study within 6 months of graduation, compared with similar graduates across the sector. In 1999-2000, the final number of 168,756 gave a response rate of 81% on which the indicators were based. Three annexes contain discussions of the First Destination Return survey and the benchmarks for the employment indicator and definitions of the terms used in the indicators. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 451 780

April 01/21 **Report**

# Indicators of employment

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Kier

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE033908

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND hefce

© HEFCE 2001

The copyright for this publication is held by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The material may be copied or reproduced provided that the source is acknowledged and the material, wholly or in part, is not used for commercial gain. Use of the material for commercial gain requires the prior written permission of the HEFCE.

# Indicators of employment

## Table of contents


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Background | 2 |
| | Data sources | 2 |
| | Coverage of indicators | 2 |
| | Definitions of indicators | 3 |
| | Interpretation of Table E1 | 4 |
| | Summary of results | 6 |
| | Table E1: Indicators of employment and further study | 9 |
| Annex A | First Destination Return | 18 |
| Annex B | Benchmarks for employment indicator | 20 |
| Annex C | Definitions | 27 |
| Annex D | Membership of the Performance Indicators Steering Group | 33 |

# Indicators of employment and other post-qualification activities

1. This is the first set of performance indicators (PIs) about the employment outcomes of higher education. In future, these indicators will be included with the other PIs which are published by the funding bodies each year.

## Background

2. Following the Dearing report into higher education, the higher education (HE) funding councils in the UK set up a steering group (the Performance Indicators Steering Group, PISG) to look at what PIs should be produced for higher education institutions. Membership of this group is shown at Annex D. The first set of indicators, covering access, retention and progression and research, was published in December 1999 for the 1996-97 and 1997-98 academic years, and the second set, for the 1997-1998 and 1998-99 academic years, was published in October 2000 (HEFCE publication 00/40, 'Performance indicators in higher education in the UK').

3. In the meantime, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had requested that indicators showing employment outcomes be developed. The only data available for such an indicator were found to be unsuitable, and it was agreed that the survey used, the First Destination Return, should be amended. This was done for the survey of students graduating in the 1999-2000 academic year, and it is this information that has been used to provide the indicators in this document.

## Data sources

4. The First Destination Return collects information about the activities of all students graduating from full-time HE courses, with the exception of some postgraduate diploma courses. The response rate is highest for home-domiciled graduates who obtain first degrees. Full details of the return are in Annex A.

5. The information from this return is collated by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), and held in the First Destination Supplement (FDS). It can be linked to the data on individual students held by HESA. These include information about the characteristics of the students, their courses, and their results. Where necessary we have also obtained information about student characteristics from UCAS files.

6. Background information about institutions' locations has been obtained from the annual Labour Force Survey (LFS), supplied by the Office of National Statistics (ONS). The most recent annual data set, for 1999, has been used.

## Coverage of indicators

7. As with the other performance indicators, only home-domiciled students are included in the indicator. In addition this initial publication only covers graduates qualifying with first degrees who have studied full-time.

8. It is hoped to extend this coverage soon to graduates with other undergraduate qualifications, and eventually to include postgraduate qualifiers as well. The indicators will be extended to graduates from part-time courses as soon as we can obtain robust information for this group.

9. Graduates who say they are unavailable for work, for example because they are travelling or because they are ill, are excluded from the indicators. Also excluded are those who give their main activity as 'seeking employment' (unemployed) but provide a secondary activity of in employment or in further study or involved in professional preparation. The proportions of graduates in each of these categories are given in Table E1 as context.

10. This year, a pilot study was set up to investigate the feasibility of central data collection for the FDS. About 3,000 students were selected at random for inclusion in this study, spread across all HEFCE-funded institutions. Because of potential differences in the response rates for this study, it was agreed to leave the selected students out of the population to be included in the indicators.

## Definitions of indicators

11. Two indicators of employment outcomes have been produced. For each indicator we provide:

- the actual value
- a benchmark value
- context statistics.

Some of the context statistics are common to both indicators. The definitions used are given below, with extra details in the annexes.

12. The need for two indicators arises because of questions over how to treat graduates going on to further study. While further study is a successful outcome of a first degree course, not everyone agrees that an employment indicator should include those going on to further study. The recognised International Labour Organisation (ILO) definition of people in the workforce excludes those who are studying. We have therefore produced one indicator including those in further study, and one excluding them.

### Indicator of employment and further study

13. The first indicator expresses the number of graduates who say they are in employment or in further study or training as a percentage of all those who are employed, studying or unemployed. That is:

$$\text{indicator 1} = \frac{100 \times (\text{employed} + \text{studying})}{\text{employed} + \text{unemployed} + \text{studying}}$$

### Indicator of employment

14. The second indicator only includes graduates who say they are employed or seeking employment. The indicator is the percentage of this group who are in employment. That is:

$$\text{indicator 2} = \frac{100 \times (\text{employed})}{\text{employed} + \text{unemployed}}$$

### Adjusted sector benchmarks

15. The performance indicators already published (HEFCE publication 00/40) include adjusted sector benchmarks for comparison purposes. These are sector average values that take account of the entry qualifications and subject of study of students at an institution, and their age on entry.

16. Benchmarks are included with the employment indicators, again to allow each institution to be compared to a sector value that takes some institutional differences into account. However, more factors need to be included in these benchmarks than was necessary for the others. The factors used in constructing the benchmarks include age on entry, entry qualifications and subject of study, but also gender, ethnic group, social background, degree classification, and whether or not the student was on a sandwich course. A statistical model has been developed to allow the benchmarks and their standard deviations to be calculated. The definitions used are given in Annex B, together with an explanation of the modelling procedure.

17. Because of concern that local factors such as unemployment rates could affect an institution's figures, the benchmarks here also include two institutional factors based on employment in the locality. In addition, the average A-level or Scottish Highers score on entry of its students is included as an institutional factor. Full details of these factors are provided in Annex B.

18. The aim of the benchmarks is to allow comparison of an institution's indicator with a sector value that takes into account factors outside the institution's immediate control. The decision about which factors are within the institution's control is a matter of judgement. For example, it could be argued that the subject mix of an institution is within its control, but for these benchmarks we have taken it as being given.

#### Sandwich course

19. It is known that graduates from sandwich courses do much better in the job market than graduates with similar characteristics who have not done a sandwich course. During the consultation and in the PISG, there was discussion about whether sandwich course should be included as a factor in the benchmark, and, as with subject of study, it was eventually agreed that it should be

included. As it is of such interest, we have also provided the percentage of students at an institution who graduate from such courses as a context statistic.

20. Full details of the construction of the benchmarks are included at Annex B. The annex also includes sector employment rates for the different sub-groups comprising the factors used in the benchmark.

### Context statistics

21. As well as the indicators and their benchmarks, Table E1 includes a number of context statistics. It is important that the population numbers on which the percentages are based should be known, so these are included in the table. In addition, as the FDS is a survey, the response rate for each institution is included. Indicators for institutions with relatively small populations or relatively low response rates should be treated with caution.

22. Other context statistics show: the proportion of the population who are excluded from the indicators (see paragraph 9); the proportion of graduates from medical, dental and veterinary courses; and the proportion who graduated from sandwich courses.

23. All statistics calculated come from the FDS and the HESA individualised student record. Full definitions are provided in the annexes.

## Interpretation of Table E1

24. These indicators and their benchmarks are designed to show how successful graduates from an institution are at obtaining employment or further study within six months of graduation, compared with similar graduates across the sector. Each indicator is therefore provided with a benchmark which is a sector average value based on students from across the sector with similar characteristics to those of students at the institution.

25. If an indicator is very different from its benchmark, then this suggests that other factors, including the performance of the institution but not necessarily only this, have had an effect in determining its value. Small differences from a benchmark are normally to be expected, and in order to determine whether a difference is small or large we have calculated the standard deviation of the difference. The difference has been defined as significant if it is at least three times the size of the standard deviation. A significant difference has been denoted by a plus sign (+) for employment rates above the benchmark, or a minus sign (-) for rates below the benchmark. Differences that are not marked in this way may be assumed to be small enough to be ignored.

26. A significant difference between an indicator and the benchmark suggests that there is some aspect of the institution's performance that should be examined. However, it may be that students at the institution differ from other students in ways that have not been quantified, or that there are local effects which have not been taken into account. It does not necessarily mean that the institution itself is performing 'well' or 'badly', although institutional performance may play a part.

27. The benchmark may also be used to determine the usefulness of inter-institution comparisons. If two institutions have very different benchmarks, they are so different that it would not be helpful to compare them. If the benchmarks are similar for the two institutions, and if other information suggests that the institutions are comparable, then it may be reasonable to make a direct comparison between the two sets of indicators.

### Survey at six months after graduation

28. The fact that the survey is carried out just six months after most students have graduated means that the figures produced do not give the final picture of graduate employment. Studies have shown that there is a gradual increase over the three years after graduation in the percentage of graduates who are employed (excluding those in further study), so the figure of 93 per cent of those in the job market employed after six months would be expected to increase to 97 or 98 per cent after

three years.[1] However, the relative rates after six months for different institutions, once subject differences and differences due to other student characteristics are taken into account, are likely to provide a good indication of long term performance for comparative purposes.[2]

29. One of the perceived difficulties with a survey carried out six months after graduation is that different groups of students take different lengths of time to settle into jobs. For example, it is known that women are more likely than men to find a job within the first six months, and that this pattern does not last.[3] In addition, graduates from different subject areas show significant differences in the times they take to find jobs. This was one of the reasons for including both gender and subject of study in the benchmark.

### Nature of employment

30. Both indicators are measures of employment outcomes that take no account of the type of employment obtained. At present, we do not feel that the information available about the nature of graduate jobs is sufficiently robust to provide a performance indicator. It is hoped that the current review of the FDS will improve the data available in this respect, so that we can look further at how to classify 'job quality', and whether this would be suitable as a performance indicator.

31. It should also be noted that the 'Moving on' study reported that employment six months after graduation is related not only to employment prospects over three years, but also to the quality of job obtained at the later period.[4]

### Response rates

32. The overall response rate to the FDS this year was 81 per cent. Most institutions had response rates of at least 70 per cent. A few had very low response rates, and it should be noted that the indicators for such institutions may be biased. For two institutions the response was so poor that the indicators have been omitted. Those affected are Wimbledon School of Art and Kent Institute of Art and Design.

### Missing values

33. If the response rate is low, there is always some concern that the characteristics of non-responders may be different from those who have responded. As the benchmarks have only used the characteristics of graduates for which the destination information is available, the characteristics of graduates who did not respond will not have affected them. An institution which has mainly received responses from graduates with a relatively high probability of being unemployed will (implicitly) have this taken into account.

34. We have looked at the individual characteristics of the non-respondents, and there is evidence that those from groups with the highest employment rates are slightly more likely to have responded to the survey. For example, while 55 per cent of home-domiciled graduates with first degrees are women, just 52 per cent of the non-respondents are women. The table below shows the benchmark we would get for all non-respondents, compared with that for respondents, for the indicator excluding those going on to further study. The small reduction suggests that the non-respondents are only slightly more likely than the respondents to be looking for employment.

---

[1] See, for example, the discussion at page 35 of 'Moving on – graduate careers three years after graduation' a report of work done by the Institute for Employment Research (IER), Warwick University, published in November 1999.

[2] See 'Moving on', page 38, where it states 'Institution unemployment rates among economically active graduates at 6, 12 or 18 months are highly correlated with the average duration of unemployment over 42 months'.

[3] See 'Working out', also by the IER, published in January 1999 (page 3).

[4] See 'Moving on', page 36.

### Employment rate

| | Actual | Benchmark |
|---|---|---|
| Respondents | 93% | 93% |
| Non-respondents | – | 91% |

### Art and design graduates

35. Graduates from art and design courses tend to have different employment patterns from graduates of other disciplines. Self-employment is more important for this group, for example. They may take longer to obtain employment after graduation, as they spend time preparing a portfolio or setting up a business.[5] One effect of these different patterns is to produce relatively low employment rates among such graduates at the FDS, although even here about 90 per cent of these graduates are in employment.

36. In addition many of the specialist art and design colleges are relatively small. Their employment rates are therefore susceptible to changes in the employment status of one or two graduates. Where art and design courses take place in a large institution, such low rates will usually be subsumed in the wider picture.

## Summary of results

37. In 1999-2000, there were 209,881 full-time home students who obtained first degrees. Of these, 2,647 were excluded from the FDS population for a possible trial of central data collection procedures, leaving 207,234 potential respondents. The final number of 168,756 respondents gave a response rate of 81 per cent.

38. The following tables show the numbers of respondents, and the percentages of respondents who are employed, unemployed, in further study, not available for work, or are excluded from the calculations because the main activity was seeking employment and there was also a secondary activity of in employment or in further study.

### Summary of sector responses

| | Number of graduates |
|---|---|
| Total graduates | 209,881 |
| Excluded for central collection pilot study | 2,647 |
| Total eligible population | 207,234 |
| Respondents | 168,756 |
| As % of eligible population | 81.4% |

### Destinations of graduates

| | Number of graduates | Percent of respondents |
|---|---|---|
| Employed | 115,347 | 68.4 |
| Unemployed | 9,244 | 5.5 |
| Studying | 32,336 | 19.2 |
| Not available for work | 10,063 | 6.0 |
| Excluded | 1,610 | 1.0 |
| All respondents | 168,756 | |

39. The sector values of the two employment rates used as performance indicators are shown below, together with the numbers of graduates included. The first indicator is the percentage of graduates who are employed or in further study among all who are employed, in further study or unemployed; the second is the percentage who are employed among all who are employed or unemployed.

40. The numbers in this table are slightly different from the totals in Table E1, as they include the figures for the two institutions with poor response rates.

[5] 'Destinations and Reflections – Careers of British art, craft and design graduates' by Lee Harvey and Alison Blackwell, published in 1999 by the Centre for Research into Quality, University of Central England in Birmingham.

**Sector indicators 1999-2000**

| | Number | Percentage employed or studying |
|---|---|---|
| Employed, studying or unemployed | 156,927 | 94.1% |
| Employed or unemployed | 124,591 | 92.6% |

## Omissions

41. The following institutions have been omitted from the table because the numbers of graduates eligible for inclusion are too small: RCN Institute, School of Pharmacy, Birkbeck College, Institute of Education. All the above figures exclude information from these institutions. As there are no graduates from full-time courses from the Open University, it does not appear in the table. The following institutions with no undergraduate courses are also excluded: Institute of Cancer Research, London Business School, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Royal College of Art.

# Table E1: Indicators of employment and further study

## Table explanation

1. The table contains five sections, for the two indicators, their benchmarks and the context statistics. The following paragraphs explain what each column of the table contains. Definitions can be found elsewhere in this document.

### Total population

2. The first section contains the total number of graduates from each institution who were eligible for inclusion in the indicators, and the proportion who responded to the First Destination Return. Note that all graduates selected for inclusion in the pilot survey of central data collection have been excluded from this number. (See Annex A, paragraph 10.)

### Employment indicator 1

3. The first indicator is the proportion of respondents who are in employment or in further study or training from among those who are employed, studying or seeking employment.

4. This section gives the base population (the number of respondents who said they were employed, studying or unemployed); the indicator; and the benchmark.

5. The final column in this section contains a symbol to show if the indicator is significantly different from its benchmark. If the column is blank, then the indicator and its benchmark are similar. If it contains a plus sign then the institution's employment rate is significantly higher than its benchmark, and if it contains a minus sign the institution's employment rate is significantly lower than its benchmark.

### Employment indicator 2

6. This section gives the second employment indicator, the proportion of economically active graduates who are employed. The base population is the number of respondents who say they are employed or unemployed, and again the fourth column in the section shows whether the difference between the indicator and its benchmark is significant.

### Context statistics of respondents

7. The three statistics in this section show the percentage of respondents in each of the three categories 'studying', 'not available for work', or 'excluded because they gave a main activity of seeking employment and a secondary activity of in work or further study'. They are included to provide a complete picture of the post-qualification activities of the graduates from each institution.

### Context statistics of eligible population

8. This last section contains context statistics based on the whole of the population from the institution who are eligible for inclusion in the indicators, whether or not they completed a First Destination Return. The first column shows the percentage of those who graduated who were studying medicine, dentistry or veterinary science. Institutions with large proportions of such graduates will tend to have higher employment rates than other similar institutions.

9. The second column gives the percentage of graduates who had been on sandwich courses. The work experience obtained on such courses is known to improve students' prospects of obtaining employment on graduation, and again institutions with large proportions of such graduates will tend to have higher employment rates.

10. Both subject group and sandwich course have been included as factors in the benchmark. The benchmarks for institutions with high proportions of medical, dental or veterinary graduates, or with high proportions from sandwich courses, will therefore also have more demanding benchmarks than other institutions.

### Locality definition

11. The unemployment rate and the percentage of graduate jobs for each institution's locality have been included in the benchmark (see Annex B). The locality could not be defined for a few institutions, and these are marked ‡ in the table. The national rates have been used in the benchmarks for these institutions.

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population: Eligible population | Total population: Response rate | Employment indicator 1* (including further study): Base population | Indicator | Benchmark | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study): Base population | Indicator | Benchmark | | Context statistics of respondents: Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Context statistics of eligible population: Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| **UK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All UK institutions | 207,234 | 81 | 156,821 | 94 | | | 124,499 | 93 | | | 19 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| **England** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All English institutions | 168,688 | 81 | 126,912 | 94 | | | 102,062 | 93 | | | 18 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Anglia Polytechnic University | 1,626 | 72 | 1,112 | 94 | 93 | | 950 | 92 | 92 | | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Aston University | 933 | 75 | 661 | 96 | 96 | | 585 | 96 | 95 | | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| University of Bath | 1,050 | 89 | 848 | 96 | 97 | | 688 | 95 | 95 | | 17 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 71 |
| Bath Spa University College | 639 | 79 | 469 | 93 | 93 | | 382 | 92 | 92 | | 17 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Birmingham | 3,293 | 87 | 2,635 | 96 | 95 | | 1,962 | 94 | 94 | | 23 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| Bishop Grosseteste College | 197 | 89 | 170 | 99 | 98 | | 166 | 99 | 97 | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Bolton Institute of Higher Education | 698 | 70 | 459 | 91 | 91 | | 363 | 88 | 89 | | 20 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Bournemouth University | 1,534 | 88 | 1,284 | 93 | 95 | | 1,203 | 92 | 94 | | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| University of Bradford | 1,261 | 84 | 974 | 96 | 95 | | 835 | 95 | 93 | | 13 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 27 |
| Bretton Hall | 503 | 82 | 383 | 97 | 94 | | 318 | 96 | 92 | | 16 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Brighton | 1,602 | 82 | 1,229 | 95 | 95 | | 1,127 | 95 | 94 | | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Bristol | 2,270 | 89 | 1,852 | 96 | 96 | | 1,371 | 95 | 94 | | 24 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Brunel University | 2,019 | 84 | 1,543 | 97 | 95 | + | 1,295 | 97 | 93 | + | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College | 1,065 | 84 | 825 | 93 | 93 | | 760 | 92 | 92 | | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| University of Cambridge | 2,766 | 79 | 2,043 | 98 | 97 | | 1,104 | 97 | 95 | | 43 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 3 |
| Canterbury Christ Church University College‡ | 929 | 90 | 800 | 96 | 95 | | 649 | 95 | 93 | | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Central England in Birmingham | 2,009 | 87 | 1,632 | 94 | 92 | | 1,362 | 93 | 91 | | 16 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| University of Central Lancashire | 2,297 | 82 | 1,756 | 92 | 93 | | 1,455 | 90 | 91 | | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.

*/‡ See introduction to table

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population | | Employment indicator 1* (including further study) | | | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study) | | | | Context statistics of respondents | | | Context statistics of eligible population | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eligible population | Response rate | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | | Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| Central School of Speech and Drama | 125 | 76 | 88 | 98 | 95 | | 84 | 98 | 94 | | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Cheltenham and Gloucester CHE | 1,133 | 88 | 937 | 96 | 95 | | 834 | 95 | 94 | | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Chester College of Higher Education | 521 | 89 | 434 | 93 | 93 | | 342 | 91 | 92 | | 20 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University College Chichester | 729 | 80 | 540 | 97 | 95 | | 464 | 97 | 95 | | 13 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| City University | 713 | 87 | 579 | 96 | 94 | | 475 | 95 | 92 | | 17 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Coventry University | 1,929 | 60 | 1,103 | 95 | 93 | | 880 | 94 | 92 | | 19 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| Cranfield University | 157 | 98 | 147 | 97 | 95 | | 132 | 96 | 95 | | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| Cumbria College of Art & Design | 188 | 84 | 144 | 77 | 85 | - | 129 | 74 | 83 | - | 9 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Dartington College of Arts | 108 | 60 | 54 | 94 | 94 | | 43 | 93 | 92 | | 17 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| De Montfort University | 2,909 | 76 | 2,102 | 94 | 92 | | 1,767 | 92 | 91 | | 15 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Derby | 1,923 | 83 | 1,493 | 92 | 93 | | 1,303 | 91 | 91 | | 12 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| University of Durham | 2,431 | 89 | 1,964 | 94 | 95 | | 1,371 | 91 | 93 | | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of East Anglia | 1,459 | 89 | 1,211 | 93 | 94 | | 903 | 91 | 92 | | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of East London | 1,235 | 79 | 914 | 86 | 90 | - | 752 | 84 | 87 | - | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Edge Hill College of Higher Education | 931 | 84 | 757 | 93 | 93 | | 605 | 92 | 92 | | 20 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Essex | 698 | 80 | 525 | 95 | 94 | | 352 | 93 | 91 | | 31 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Exeter | 1,878 | 89 | 1,546 | 94 | 95 | | 1,180 | 92 | 94 | | 22 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Falmouth College of Arts | 291 | 99 | 258 | 74 | 85 | - | 239 | 72 | 84 | - | 7 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Goldsmiths College | 838 | 74 | 562 | 92 | 93 | | 451 | 90 | 90 | | 18 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Greenwich | 1,675 | 80 | 1,244 | 93 | 93 | | 1,056 | 92 | 91 | | 14 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| Harper Adams University College | 239 | 99 | 192 | 88 | 92 | - | 179 | 87 | 91 | | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 85 |





+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.

*/‡ See introduction to table

HEPCE 01/21 11

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population: Eligible population | Total population: Response rate | Employment indicator 1* (including further study): Base population | Employment indicator 1*: Indicator | Employment indicator 1*: Bench-mark | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study): Base population | Employment indicator 2*: Indicator | Employment indicator 2*: Bench-mark | | Context statistics of respondents: Study or training | Context statistics of respondents: Not available | Context statistics of respondents: Excluded | Context statistics of eligible population: Medical, dental and veterinary | Context statistics of eligible population: Sandwich |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| University of Hertfordshire | 2,247 | 77 | 1,611 | 93 | 94 | | 1,380 | 92 | 93 | | 13 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 36 |
| Homerton College, Cambridge | 152 | 88 | 129 | 99 | 100 | | 123 | 99 | 100 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Huddersfield | 1,816 | 79 | 1,336 | 91 | 93 | | 1,105 | 89 | 91 | | 16 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 31 |
| University of Hull | 1,687 | 86 | 1,347 | 97 | 94 | + | 1,004 | 96 | 93 | + | 24 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperial College | 1,016 | 94 | 901 | 98 | 96 | | 694 | 97 | 95 | | 22 | 4 | 1 | 25 | 0 |
| Keele University | 1,087 | 84 | 879 | 95 | 94 | | 635 | 93 | 92 | | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Kent at Canterbury | 1,180 | 85 | 947 | 98 | 94 | + | 681 | 97 | 92 | + | 26 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Kent Institute of Art & Design | 316 | 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| King Alfred's College, Winchester | 722 | 84 | 581 | 95 | 95 | | 502 | 94 | 94 | | 13 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| King's College London | 1,953 | 72 | 1,311 | 94 | 95 | | 960 | 91 | 94 | | 25 | 5 | 1 | 24 | 0 |
| Kingston University | 1,896 | 85 | 1,505 | 94 | 93 | | 1,275 | 93 | 92 | | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Lancaster University | 1,828 | 82 | 1,401 | 93 | 94 | | 976 | 90 | 92 | | 28 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| University of Leeds | 4,049 | 85 | 3,142 | 96 | 95 | | 2,443 | 95 | 93 | | 20 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Leeds Metropolitan University | 2,632 | 81 | 1,974 | 91 | 94 | - | 1,805 | 91 | 93 | - | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| University of Leicester | 1,851 | 88 | 1,524 | 95 | 95 | | 1,120 | 93 | 93 | | 25 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| University of Lincolnshire and Humberside | 1,706 | 82 | 1,307 | 92 | 92 | | 1,146 | 91 | 90 | | 12 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| University of Liverpool | 2,429 | 84 | 1,918 | 96 | 95 | | 1,458 | 94 | 93 | | 22 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Liverpool Hope | 820 | 78 | 611 | 94 | 93 | | 455 | 93 | 91 | | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Liverpool John Moores University | 2,435 | 81 | 1,871 | 90 | 93 | - | 1,600 | 89 | 92 | - | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| University of London (Institutes and activities) | 43 | 70 | 26 | 100 | 99 | | 20 | 100 | 99 | | 20 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| London Sch of Economics & Political Sci | 468 | 81 | 358 | 95 | 95 | | 255 | 93 | 93 | | 27 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |





+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.

*/‡ See introduction to table

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population | | Employment indicator 1* (including further study) | | | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study) | | | | Context statistics of respondents | | | Context statistics of eligible population | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eligible population | Response rate | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | | Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| London Guildhall University | 1,163 | 83 | 854 | 87 | 91 | - | 677 | 84 | 88 | - | 18 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| The London Institute | 1,245 | 82 | 866 | 93 | 91 | | 783 | 93 | 89 | | 8 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| Loughborough University | 2,063 | 75 | 1,444 | 97 | 95 | + | 1,109 | 96 | 93 | + | 22 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| University of Luton | 1,155 | 83 | 878 | 100 | 93 | + | 757 | 100 | 92 | + | 13 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| University of Manchester | 3,398 | 82 | 2,535 | 96 | 95 | | 1,842 | 95 | 93 | | 25 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 4 |
| UMIST | 1,027 | 77 | 730 | 95 | 94 | | 583 | 94 | 93 | | 19 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Manchester Metropolitan University | 4,251 | 78 | 3,025 | 92 | 93 | | 2,539 | 90 | 91 | | 15 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| Middlesex University | 2,254 | 63 | 1,327 | 92 | 92 | | 1,034 | 90 | 90 | | 21 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| University of Newcastle upon Tyne | 2,408 | 91 | 2,023 | 94 | 95 | | 1,602 | 93 | 93 | | 19 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Newman College | 193 | 74 | 136 | 100 | 97 | | 112 | 100 | 97 | | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University College Northampton | 1,480 | 79 | 1,114 | 95 | 94 | | 928 | 94 | 92 | | 16 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| University of North London | 1,104 | 75 | 773 | 93 | 92 | | 648 | 92 | 90 | | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| North Riding College | 372 | 79 | 267 | 90 | 93 | | 215 | 87 | 91 | | 18 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Northern School of Contemporary Dance‡ | 39 | 87 | 30 | 97 | 96 | | 27 | 96 | 94 | | 9 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Northumbria at Newcastle | 2,636 | 78 | 1,867 | 93 | 93 | | 1,622 | 92 | 92 | | 12 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 32 |
| Norwich School of Art & Design | 184 | 74 | 116 | 84 | 87 | | 101 | 81 | 85 | | 11 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Nottingham | 2,518 | 86 | 1,944 | 97 | 96 | | 1,469 | 95 | 94 | | 22 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Nottingham Trent University | 3,253 | 83 | 2,472 | 98 | 94 | + | 2,180 | 97 | 92 | + | 11 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 32 |
| School of Oriental and African Studies | 285 | 77 | 192 | 89 | 92 | | 127 | 83 | 87 | | 30 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Oxford | 2,891 | 81 | 2,137 | 95 | 97 | | 1,396 | 93 | 95 | | 32 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Oxford Brookes University | 1,606 | 72 | 1,097 | 95 | 96 | | 933 | 94 | 96 | | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 |





+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.

*/‡ See introduction to table

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population | | Employment indicator 1* (including further study) | | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study) | | | Context statistics of respondents | | | Context statistics of eligible population | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eligible population | Response rate | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
| | | % | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| University of Plymouth | 2,942 | 79 | 2,156 | 93 | 93 | 1,826 | 92 | 91 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| University of Portsmouth | 2,146 | 83 | 1,664 | 96 | 94 | 1,427 | 96 | 93 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Queen Mary and Westfield College | 1,425 | 83 | 1,104 | 93 | 93 | 734 | 89 | 91 | 31 | 4 | 2 | 20 | 0 |
| Ravensbourne College | 112 | 55 | 57 | 93 | 91 | 48 | 92 | 90 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Reading | 1,731 | 87 | 1,407 | 96 | 96 | 1,128 | 95 | 95 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| College of Ripon & York St John | 842 | 83 | 678 | 96 | 94 | 545 | 95 | 93 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rose Bruford College | 126 | 52 | 63 | 95 | 95 | 59 | 95 | 94 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Royal Academy of Music | 47 | 77 | 36 | 100 | 98 | 32 | 100 | 98 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Royal College of Music | 74 | 85 | 60 | 98 | 97 | 39 | 97 | 96 | 33 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Royal Holloway, University of London | 1,103 | 78 | 788 | 94 | 95 | 551 | 92 | 94 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Royal Northern College of Music | 75 | 91 | 65 | 100 | 97 | 39 | 100 | 97 | 38 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Royal Veterinary College | 74 | 85 | 63 | 94 | 97 | 61 | 93 | 97 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| St George's Hospital Medical School | 136 | 83 | 113 | 100 | 100 | 113 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| College of St Mark & St John | 574 | 68 | 363 | 98 | 95 | 305 | 98 | 95 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| St Martin's College | 840 | 90 | 723 | 95 | 95 | 646 | 95 | 95 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| St Mary's College | 526 | 87 | 432 | 96 | 96 | 381 | 96 | 95 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Salford | 2,108 | 86 | 1,722 | 90 | 93 - | 1,475 | 89 | 91 - | 14 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| University of Sheffield | 2,991 | 88 | 2,448 | 95 | 96 | 1,861 | 94 | 94 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| Sheffield Hallam University | 3,268 | 83 | 2,561 | 93 | 94 | 2,306 | 93 | 93 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 32 |
| University of Southampton | 2,957 | 79 | 2,196 | 95 | 95 | 1,737 | 93 | 94 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Southampton Institute | 2,267 | 67 | 1,402 | 94 | 93 | 1,318 | 93 | 92 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 14 |





+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.
*/‡ See introduction to table

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population | | Employment indicator 1* (including further study) | | | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study) | | | | Context statistics of respondents | | | Context statistics of eligible population | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eligible population | Response rate | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | | Base population | Indicator | Bench-mark | | Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| South Bank University | 1,585 | 54 | 806 | 87 | 91 | - | 669 | 84 | 89 | - | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Staffordshire University | 2,155 | 66 | 1,342 | 92 | 92 | | 1,058 | 90 | 91 | | 20 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| University of Sunderland | 1,850 | 86 | 1,496 | 94 | 92 | | 1,251 | 93 | 91 | | 15 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| The Surrey Inst of Art & Design Univ Col | 623 | 82 | 440 | 90 | 90 | | 420 | 90 | 89 | | 4 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Surrey | 697 | 82 | 551 | 99 | 98 | | 452 | 99 | 97 | | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 79 |
| University of Surrey Roehampton | 1,165 | 79 | 841 | 95 | 94 | | 678 | 94 | 94 | | 18 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Sussex | 1,392 | 73 | 925 | 92 | 95 | - | 686 | 89 | 93 | - | 23 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Teesside | 1,332 | 83 | 1,055 | 91 | 92 | | 841 | 89 | 90 | | 19 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Thames Valley University | 1,107 | 72 | 760 | 89 | 91 | | 609 | 86 | 89 | | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Trinity & All Saints | 550 | 81 | 429 | 97 | 95 | | 402 | 97 | 94 | | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trinity College of Music | 69 | 74 | 50 | 100 | 98 | | 25 | 100 | 99 | | 49 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University College London | 2,096 | 82 | 1,548 | 93 | 96 | | 1,151 | 91 | 94 | | 23 | 8 | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| University of Warwick | 1,853 | 93 | 1,566 | 94 | 96 | | 1,221 | 93 | 94 | | 20 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| University of West of England, Bristol | 2,903 | 83 | 2,220 | 95 | 95 | | 1,814 | 94 | 93 | | 17 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 27 |
| University of Westminster | 1,462 | 80 | 1,092 | 92 | 92 | | 856 | 90 | 90 | | 20 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| Westminster College, Oxford | 137 | 48 | 63 | 95 | 95 | | 50 | 94 | 95 | | 20 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Wimbledon School of Art | 118 | 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| University of Wolverhampton | 2,358 | 82 | 1,834 | 89 | 91 | | 1,451 | 86 | 89 | | 20 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| University College Worcester | 667 | 91 | 583 | 96 | 94 | | 471 | 95 | 93 | | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Writtle College | 179 | 66 | 108 | 89 | 91 | | 99 | 88 | 90 | | 8 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Wye College, University of London | 129 | 92 | 110 | 94 | 94 | | 90 | 92 | 93 | | 17 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of York | 1,238 | 87 | 1,017 | 96 | 95 | | 700 | 95 | 93 | | 29 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7 |





+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.

*/‡ See introduction to table

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population: Eligible population | Total population: Response rate | Employment indicator 1* (including further study): Base population | Indicator | Benchmark | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study): Base population | Indicator | Benchmark | | Context statistics of respondents: Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Context statistics of eligible population: Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| **Scotland** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Scottish institutions | 20,842 | 82 | 15,886 | 95 | | | 12,259 | 93 | | | 21 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| University of Aberdeen | 1,527 | 87 | 1,233 | 97 | 94 | + | 827 | 96 | 93 | + | 31 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| University of Abertay Dundee | 579 | 76 | 418 | 93 | 92 | | 353 | 91 | 90 | | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Dundee | 1,216 | 87 | 971 | 96 | 95 | | 672 | 94 | 93 | | 28 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 7 |
| University of Edinburgh | 3,227 | 84 | 2,450 | 96 | 95 | | 1,874 | 95 | 94 | | 21 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| Edinburgh College of Art | 243 | 72 | 163 | 88 | 91 | | 113 | 82 | 87 | | 29 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| University of Glasgow | 2,687 | 90 | 2,247 | 93 | 95 | | 1,642 | 91 | 93 | - | 25 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 1 |
| Glasgow Caledonian University | 1,959 | 73 | 1,343 | 93 | 94 | | 1,182 | 92 | 92 | | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| Glasgow School of Art | 230 | 59 | 129 | 95 | 92 | | 101 | 93 | 90 | | 21 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Heriot-Watt University | 922 | 86 | 729 | 95 | 94 | | 625 | 94 | 92 | | 13 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Napier University | 1,235 | 80 | 936 | 97 | 94 | + | 637 | 95 | 93 | | 30 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Northern College of Education | 180 | 56 | 100 | 97 | 97 | | 99 | 97 | 97 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Paisley‡ | 1,152 | 84 | 924 | 88 | 91 | - | 786 | 85 | 89 | - | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Queen Margaret University College | 615 | 69 | 401 | 97 | 96 | | 377 | 97 | 96 | | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Robert Gordon University | 930 | 86 | 754 | 98 | 96 | | 668 | 98 | 95 | | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 21 |
| Royal Scottish Academy of Music & Drama | 117 | 59 | 67 | 93 | 93 | | 41 | 88 | 89 | | 38 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of St Andrews‡ | 846 | 87 | 685 | 96 | 95 | | 408 | 93 | 93 | | 37 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| University of Stirling | 895 | 84 | 670 | 96 | 93 | | 549 | 95 | 91 | | 16 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Strathclyde‡ | 2,282 | 79 | 1,666 | 95 | 95 | | 1,305 | 94 | 94 | | 20 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |





+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.
*/‡ See introduction to table

## Table E1: Employment indicators

**Students obtaining first degrees from full-time courses, 1999-2000**

| Institution | Total population: Eligible population | Total population: Response rate | Employment indicator 1* (including further study): Base population | Employment indicator 1*: Indicator | Employment indicator 1*: Benchmark | | Employment indicator 2* (excluding further study): Base population | Employment indicator 2*: Indicator | Employment indicator 2*: Benchmark | | Context statistics of respondents: Study or training | Not available | Excluded | Context statistics of eligible population: Medical, dental and veterinary | Sandwich |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | % | | % | % | | | % | % | | % | % | % | % | % |
| **Wales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Welsh institutions | 12,899 | 82 | 9,861 | 93 | | | 7,416 | 90 | | | 23 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| University of Glamorgan | 1,700 | 78 | 1,260 | 90 | 92 | | 1,030 | 88 | 91 | | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| North East Wales Institute | 502 | 85 | 405 | 92 | 93 | | 372 | 92 | 91 | | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Wales, Bangor | 1,253 | 83 | 978 | 92 | 94 | | 693 | 88 | 92 | - | 27 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Wales, Swansea | 1,741 | 89 | 1,430 | 95 | 94 | | 1,007 | 93 | 92 | | 27 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Swansea Institute of Higher Education‡ | 470 | 64 | 285 | 86 | 92 | - | 235 | 83 | 90 | - | 17 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 20 |
| Trinity College Carmarthen | 325 | 83 | 261 | 97 | 94 | | 188 | 96 | 94 | | 27 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Wales, Aberystwyth | 1,556 | 83 | 1,233 | 91 | 93 | - | 810 | 87 | 91 | - | 33 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Cardiff University | 2,958 | 82 | 2,211 | 94 | 95 | | 1,577 | 92 | 94 | | 26 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| University of Wales Institute, Cardiff | 1,072 | 72 | 712 | 91 | 94 | | 596 | 90 | 93 | | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| University of Wales, Lampeter | 344 | 70 | 219 | 87 | 90 | | 142 | 80 | 86 | - | 32 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Wales College of Medicine | 375 | 86 | 323 | 100 | 99 | | 321 | 100 | 99 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 |
| University of Wales College, Newport | 523 | 95 | 476 | 92 | 92 | | 400 | 91 | 91 | | 15 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Welsh College of Music and Drama | 80 | 88 | 68 | 99 | 97 | | 45 | 98 | 96 | | 33 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Northern Ireland** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Northern Ireland institutions | 4,805 | 91 | 4,162 | 95 | | | 2,762 | 92 | | | 32 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 18 |
| The Queen's University of Belfast‡ | 2,267 | 89 | 1,908 | 96 | 95 | | 1,033 | 92 | 93 | | 43 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| St Mary's University College‡ | 134 | 81 | 104 | 97 | 97 | | 103 | 97 | 97 | | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stranmillis University College‡ | 124 | 98 | 116 | 98 | 98 | | 115 | 98 | 97 | | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University of Ulster‡ | 2,280 | 93 | 2,034 | 94 | 94 | | 1,511 | 91 | 93 | | 25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

+/- Shows that the indicator is significantly better/worse than its benchmark.
*/‡ See introduction to table

# Annex A

## First Destination Return

### Previous arrangements

1. The First Destination Return is a survey carried out by institutions among their own graduates to obtain information about what new graduates are doing. The questions asked have been agreed with HESA, and each institution submits data in an agreed format to HESA for collation and analysis. This dataset forms the First Destination Supplement (FDS) to the individualised student record held by HESA.

2. Until this year, institutions started collecting information about graduate destinations almost as soon as the student graduated. Questionnaires were distributed to graduates, either in person or by post, and these were followed up by telephone contact if no response was received. The survey asked for details of main activity, using a question of the form 'Please tick one of the following boxes which best describes the MAIN activity you are currently undertaking, or which you will definitely begin before 31 March'. The options provided were:

- in employment (paid or unpaid)
- self-employed
- undertaking further study, training or research
- not available for (or not seeking) employment, study or training
- unemployed and seeking employment, further study or training.

3. The survey also asked if the graduate had any other, secondary, activity. The options given for the secondary activity were:

- full-time employment (paid or unpaid)
- part-time employment (paid or unpaid)
- self-employment
- full-time further study or training
- part-time further study or training
- professional preparation time, e.g. portfolio preparation
- looking for a job or course
- no secondary activity.

4. Depending on the response, there were further questions to determine the nature of the work or study, and other related details.

5. In practice, graduates who said they were seeking employment at any stage of the data collection process were followed up to see if they had subsequently obtained work, but graduates who said they were employed or studying were not followed up to see if they had changed status. Although there was a nominal reference date of 31 December as the date to which replies should refer, the long data capture period prior to this date and the flexibility allowed in its interpretation led to inconsistencies between institutions.

### Changes to FDS for 1999-2000 graduates

6. When it was suggested that the information from the survey should be used to produce a performance indicator, it was decided to hold an audit of a sample of institutions to see how robust the data would be. The audit concluded that the survey was satisfactory for its original purpose, but did not provide data that were sufficiently robust for production of a PI. However, the auditors said that if a few changes could be made to the survey, the data quality could be substantially improved.

7. There were two main changes suggested by the auditors. The first was to use a fixed reference date for the survey, so that all institutions would be asking for their graduates' status at the same time. The second change was to restrict the data collection period. Both of these were put in place for the survey of 1999-2000 graduates.

8. The questions asked in 1999-2000 were similar to those used in previous years, with the same categories provided for main and secondary activities. However, respondents were asked what their main and secondary activities would be on 3 January 2001. In addition, institutions were asked to restrict their data gathering period to between the end of September 2000 and the end of January 2001, with telephone follow-up only taking place in December and January. It was felt that these changes would provide data that would

be more comparable across institutions, and so more robust for producing the PI.

### Central data collection

9. During discussions regarding the performance indicator, it was suggested that collecting the data from this survey centrally, rather than each institution making its own arrangements, might provide more robust information. As part of a feasibility study into the issue, it was agreed to carry out a pilot survey this year, and a small sample of graduates from each institution was selected for this purpose. It was decided to omit these graduates from the population used for the employment indicators, as the different methods of collection might affect the outcomes.

### Review of First Destination Return

10. Prior to the work on an indicator of employment, the FDS was being reviewed by HESA, in consultation with HEIs and other interested bodies, as part of its general review process. The review group considered what form the survey should take in future, bearing in mind the data needs of the various stakeholders. It was at this stage that the suggestion for a pilot study into central data collection procedures was put forward. It was agreed that the review should not be implemented until the pilot was complete, so it was deferred for a year. Once implemented, it is expected that this review will improve data availability, and will eventually allow an extended set of indicators to be produced.

# Annex B

## Benchmarks for employment indicator

1. The benchmarks for the performance indicators of access to HE and retention rates, which have already been produced (see HEFCE publication 00/40), are sector averages that allow for the effects of age, subject of study and entry qualifications. So, for example, an institution with a large medical school would be expected to have a higher retention rate than a similar institution with no medical school, because medical students have a low leaving rate compared with students of other subjects.

2. A similar principle has been used in defining benchmarks for the employment indicators. Each benchmark is the value that would be expected by looking at all students across the sector who are similar to those at the institution. We have again taken into account age, subject of study and entry qualifications (education students, for example, are more likely to be employed six months after graduation than students of philosophy) but in addition we have taken other factors into account. The table below shows what factors have been used.

3. In addition to factors specific to the student, we have looked at factors that refer to each institution, and their locality. Three institutional factors have been included in the benchmarks, also shown in the following table.

Table B1: **Factors used in the benchmark**

| Student factors | No. of categories | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| Subject of study | 19 | |
| Entry qualifications | 11 | |
| Age on entry | 4 | |
| Gender | 2 | |
| Ethnic group | 10 | |
| Whether or not on sandwich course | 2 | |
| Social Class | 3 | Includes a category for unknown |
| From low participation neighbourhood or not | 3 | Includes a category for unknown |
| Degree classification | 5 | Only included in indicator which excludes those going on to further study |
| **Institutional factors** | | |
| Average A-level/Highers score | | Based on entrants in 1999-2000 with A-levels or Scottish Highers |
| Unemployment among 20-29 year olds | | Figures based on the ILO definition, for the institution's locality |
| Percentage of jobs classified as graduate jobs | | For the institution's locality, with definition based on IER work |

### Student factors

4. The subject, entry qualifications, and age groups used are all slightly different from those used in constructing the benchmarks for other indicators. The information for all of the factors, both at a student and at an institution level, comes from the HESA individualised student record, UCAS supplementary files, the First Destination Supplement, and the 1999 Annual Labour Force Survey. Full definitions, based on the HESA fields, are given in Annex C.

5. Tables B2-B6 show the unemployment rates for each group within some of the student factors.

### Institutional factors

6. The average A-level/Scottish Highers score, for those entrants to the institution who have such qualifications, is a proxy for the overall selectivity of the institution. It adds significantly to the model, and has been introduced partly to make allowances for those situations where individual student entry qualifications are missing. It will also compensate for the fact that we have only a simplified summary of entry qualifications available.

7. The other two institutional factors used are related to employment prospects in the neighbourhood of the institution. The institution's neighbourhood has been defined by reference to where its graduates get jobs, as the set of local authority areas closest to the institution in which at least half of the institution's graduates have found jobs on graduation. This information comes from the FDS, and depends on the postcode of where the graduate works being supplied. For some institutions there is not sufficient postcode information available, and in such cases the national rates have been used. These institutions have been noted in the table.

8. The unemployment rate in the neighbourhood among all 20-29 year olds has been taken from the Labour Force Survey for 1999. The percentage of all jobs in the neighbourhood which can be classified as graduate jobs also comes from that survey, and is based on the classification through Standard Occupational Classification as developed at the Institute of Economic Research (IER) at Warwick University for the report 'Moving On'. Details are given in Annex C.

## Model used to produce benchmark

9. The benchmarks produced for the performance indicators of access and retention were based on a simple arithmetic model. As there are more factors to take into account in the benchmarks for the employment indicator, it has not proved possible to use this simple method of construction. Instead, it was decided to use a statistical model. A number of models were investigated, and a random-effects multi-level model was chosen to construct the benchmarks.

10. Multi-level models are used when the outcomes for individuals may be affected by both individual characteristics and characteristics of groups to which the individuals belong. In this case, whether a graduate is employed or not will depend on individual characteristics of the graduate, but possibly also on characteristics of the institution or its location. The form of model used is:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k x_{ijk} + \sum_{l=1}^{n} \gamma_l x_{jl} + u_j + e_{ij}$$

where $y_{ij}$ is an indicator of employment for student i at institution j (that is, $y_{ij}$ is 1 if the student is employed, and is 0 otherwise), and there are m student-level factors $x_{ijk}$, and n institution-level factors $x_{jl}$.

11. The terms $u_j$ and $e_{ij}$ represent the random factors at institutional and individual levels respectively. Both terms are assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of zero. The software package used, MLwiN, not only provides estimates of the coefficients $\beta$ and $\gamma$ but also estimates these random terms and their associated standard deviations. The institution term, $u_j$, provides an estimate of the difference between an institution's benchmark and its indicator, allowing the benchmark and the standard deviation of the

difference to be obtained. The estimates of the coefficients are shown in Table B11.

12. Institutions where the value of $u_j$ is large compared with the standard deviation – say, three times the standard deviation in absolute value – are those where the indicator and the benchmark are significantly different. For such institutions the factors used have not completely accounted for the differences from the sector, and it may be that the performance of the institution has been particularly good or particularly poor.

13. Alternatives to the linear form of the model used here include random-effects logistic regression models. In some contexts such models have advantages over linear formulations with dichotomous outcomes, but the logistic approach runs into difficulties when the available predictor variables identify subsets of individuals with 0 per cent or 100 per cent success rates. This occurs here as some of the smaller specialist institutions have employment rates close to 100 per cent. Professor David Draper of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and Mark Gittoes of the University of Bath have shown through simulation experiments that random-effects linear modelling provides a reliable basis for identifying unusual universities in this situation.[1]

### Interactions between factors

14. It was originally intended to use two models, one for males and one for females, to allow for the interactions between gender and the other variables. However, it was found that, although these interactions exist, using a single model with gender as one of the factors did not significantly change the benchmarks produced.

15. The possibility of including a limited number of interaction terms was also looked at, but again these did not change the benchmarks significantly. In particular, the interaction between gender and ethnic group, which appears relatively large, did not make a significant change to the model.

## Employment rates

16. The following tables show the number of graduates who are employed, in further study, or unemployed in each category of each factor, and the percentage who are in employment or further study, or in employment. These figures are not adjusted for other factors.

17. In each table, the numbers employed or in further study or unemployed are shown as 'Base pop 1', with the numbers employed or unemployed shown as 'Base pop 2'. 'Indicator 1' is the percentage of Base pop 1 who are employed or studying; while 'Indicator 2' is the percentage of Base pop 2 who are employed.

[1] A technical report is available from the authors, and will also be made available on the PI web-site.

Table B2: **Employment by subject of study**

| Subject | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Medicine, dentistry, veterinary science | 4,804 | 99.5 | 4,400 | 99.5 |
| Pharmacy, Ophthalmics, Nursing, Medical Technology | 3,539 | 99.0 | 3,473 | 98.9 |
| Other subjects allied to medicine | 5,917 | 96.2 | 4,742 | 95.3 |
| Biological sciences | 12,232 | 94.0 | 8,472 | 91.3 |
| Agriculture | 1,411 | 92.9 | 1,203 | 91.7 |
| Physical sciences | 9,082 | 93.3 | 6,103 | 90.0 |
| Mathematical sciences | 3,002 | 94.2 | 2,176 | 92.0 |
| Computer science | 6,555 | 91.8 | 6,145 | 91.1 |
| Engineering & technology | 9,741 | 92.8 | 8,316 | 91.5 |
| Architecture, building & planning | 3,327 | 96.0 | 2,798 | 95.2 |
| Economics, Social work, Geography | 5,222 | 94.8 | 4,302 | 93.6 |
| Other social & political studies, and Law | 15,010 | 94.2 | 9,537 | 90.9 |
| Business & administrative studies | 17,399 | 94.1 | 15,836 | 93.5 |
| Librarianship & information science | 2,966 | 91.5 | 2,694 | 90.6 |
| Languages and Humanities | 18,274 | 93.9 | 12,787 | 91.3 |
| Music and Drama | 3,673 | 94.3 | 2,667 | 92.1 |
| Other creative arts | 9,054 | 89.3 | 7,818 | 87.6 |
| Education | 8,674 | 98.1 | 8,229 | 98.0 |
| Combined studies | 17,045 | 93.7 | 12,993 | 91.7 |
| All subjects | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B3: **Employment by entry qualification**

| Entry qualifications | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A-levels*, points unknown | 3,748 | 93.8 | 3,018 | 92.2 |
| A-levels*, up to 8 points | 12,351 | 93.1 | 10,183 | 91.6 |
| A-levels*, 9 to 12 points | 14,084 | 94.2 | 11,682 | 93.0 |
| A-levels*, 13 to 18 points | 28,123 | 94.7 | 22,489 | 93.3 |
| A-levels*, 19 to 24 points | 30,867 | 95.2 | 23,747 | 93.8 |
| A-levels*, 25 to 30 points | 29,711 | 96.3 | 21,466 | 94.9 |
| Access course | 8,528 | 89.9 | 6,811 | 87.3 |
| BTEC or equivalent | 5,733 | 91.2 | 5,073 | 90.0 |
| GNVQ level 3+ | 4,105 | 91.5 | 3,663 | 90.5 |
| Higher education | 12,707 | 92.4 | 10,924 | 91.1 |
| Other / not known | 6,970 | 91.9 | 5,535 | 89.8 |
| All qualifications | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

* or Scottish Highers

Table B4: **Employment by age on entry to higher education**

| Age on entry | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 21 | 124,690 | 94.7 | 98,633 | 93.3 |
| 21 to 24 | 15,962 | 92.1 | 13,473 | 90.7 |
| 25 or over | 16,241 | 91.3 | 12,454 | 88.7 |
| Unknown | 34 | 85.3 | 31 | 83.9 |
| All ages | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B5: **Employment by gender**

| Gender | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 87,218 | 95.3 | 68,755 | 94.1 |
| Male | 69,709 | 92.6 | 55,836 | 90.8 |
| All | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B6: **Employment by whether or not on sandwich course**

| | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| On sandwich course | 16,386 | 95.1 | 14,591 | 94.5 |
| Not on sandwich course | 140,541 | 94.0 | 110,000 | 92.3 |
| All | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B7: **Employment by ethnic group**

| Ethnic group | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | 132,542 | 94.6 | 105,942 | 93.2 |
| Black Caribbean | 1,097 | 90.7 | 908 | 88.8 |
| Black African | 1,415 | 87.0 | 1,032 | 82.2 |
| Black other | 531 | 92.7 | 425 | 90.8 |
| Indian | 5,259 | 91.7 | 3,979 | 89.1 |
| Pakistani | 2,240 | 89.0 | 1,599 | 84.6 |
| Bangladeshi | 655 | 88.4 | 488 | 84.4 |
| Chinese | 1,339 | 90.3 | 940 | 86.2 |
| Asian other | 1,480 | 92.7 | 1,104 | 90.2 |
| Other / not known | 10,369 | 93.0 | 8,174 | 91.2 |
| All | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B8: **Employment by Social Class**

| Social Class | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Social Class I, II, IIIn | 82,980 | 95.1 | 65,050 | 93.8 |
| Social Class IIIm, IV, V | 25,178 | 94.2 | 20,007 | 92.7 |
| Unknown Social Class | 48,769 | 92.3 | 39,534 | 90.6 |
| All ages | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B9: **Employment by neighbourhood type**

| Neighbourhood type | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low participation | 19,254 | 93.2 | 15,322 | 91.5 |
| Other known type | 136,303 | 94.2 | 108,237 | 92.8 |
| Unknown | 1,370 | 92.9 | 1,032 | 90.6 |
| All ages | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B10: **Employment by degree class**

| Degree class | Base pop 1 | Indicator 1 | Base pop 2 | Indicator 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| First class honours | 13,520 | 96.9 | 8,855 | 95.2 |
| Upper second class honours | 75,511 | 95.1 | 55,562 | 93.6 |
| Lower second class, or undivided second class honours | 52,525 | 92.6 | 44,116 | 91.2 |
| Third class honours | 6,636 | 88.9 | 5,833 | 87.4 |
| Other classification | 11,735 | 94.6 | 10,225 | 93.8 |
| All ages | 156,927 | 94.1 | 124,591 | 92.6 |

Table B11: **Coefficients in model excluding further study**

(See tables in Annex C for codes used)

| Variable | Coefficient | Variable | Coefficient | Variable | Coefficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Constant | 1.022 | Entry qual 2 | -0.008 | Male | -0.030 |
| | | Entry qual 3 | -0.002 | | |
| Subject A | 0.016 | Entry qual 4 | -0.002 | Ethnic group 2 | -0.027 |
| Subject C | -0.048 | Entry qual 5 | -0.001 | Ethnic group 3 | -0.083 |
| Subject D | -0.090 | Entry qual 6 | 0.001 | Ethnic group 4 | -0.007 |
| Subject E | -0.075 | Entry qual 7 | -0.026 | Ethnic group 5 | -0.050 |
| Subject F | -0.099 | Entry qual 8 | -0.012 | Ethnic group 6 | -0.085 |
| Subject G | -0.085 | Entry qual 9 | -0.019 | Ethnic group 7 | -0.079 |
| Subject H | -0.070 | Entry qual 10 | -0.005 | Ethnic group 8 | -0.074 |
| Subject I | -0.076 | Entry qual 11 | -0.009 | Ethnic group 9 | -0.035 |
| Subject J | -0.037 | | | Ethnic group 10 | -0.017 |
| Subject K | -0.061 | Degree 2 | -0.018 | | |
| Subject L | -0.089 | Degree 3 | -0.036 | Neigh'hood 2 | 0.001 |
| Subject M | -0.061 | Degree 4 | -0.061 | Neigh'hood 3 | -0.012 |
| Subject N | -0.091 | Degree 5 | -0.046 | Social Class 1 | 0.003 |
| Subject O | -0.099 | | | Social Class 3 | -0.002 |
| Subject P | -0.089 | Age 2 | -0.010 | | |
| Subject Q | -0.112 | Age 3 | -0.041 | **Institutional factors** | |
| Subject R | -0.019 | Age 4 | -0.084 | Average A-level | 0.001 |
| Subject S | -0.082 | | | Unemp. rate | -0.178 |
| | | | | % grad. jobs | 0.097 |
| Sandwich | 0.019 | | | | |

# Annex C

## Definitions

## Definitions of factors

1. In defining the groupings of each factor that have been used in constructing the benchmarks, we have taken into account the employment rates at different levels of the factor. We have tried to balance the need for a reasonably small number of groups against the requirement for homogeneity. In most cases we have had to include an 'unknown' category.

2. Tables C1 to C8 have been included at the end of this annex.

### Subject of study

3. Table C1 shows the subject groupings used. It also provides the HESA codes used.

4. Institutions return information to HESA about each student's subjects of study, using up to three fields (subject of qualification aim). We have defined broad subject groups, based on this information, and allocated each student to one of the groups. A student whose subjects cover different groups will be included in the 'Combined studies' group.

5. The groups were chosen to be as homogeneous as possible as regards employment rates, but bearing in mind that there should not be too many groups, nor groups containing small numbers. For example, it was found that among subjects allied to medicine there were two distinct sub-groups. Graduates from Pharmacy, Ophthalmics, Nursing and Medical technology showed much higher employment rates than graduates from the other subjects in this group, so were treated separately. Conversely, as graduates from Languages and Humanities showed similar employment rates, these two subject areas were combined.

### Entry qualifications

6. Institutions return data to HESA about the entry qualifications of their students, by providing a code to denote the type of qualification (QUALENT2), and by providing the points score for those entering with A-levels or Scottish Highers. In cases where the institution has not provided this information, it has been taken from UCAS. For the benchmarks for the access and retention indicators, the point scores were grouped in pairs, but it was found that fewer groups could be used in this exercise. The groups are shown in Table C2.

### Age group

7. The age on entry to HE of a student is classified in a variety of ways. Those under 21 years of age at entry are young students, those aged 25 or over are generally classed as mature, while those between 21 and 25 are sometimes treated as young, sometimes as mature. In this case, we have treated all three groups separately. The groups used are in Table C3.

8. We have defined age on entry as the age at 30 September of the year of entry to the institution, as defined by their date of commencement of studies.

9. Unknown age includes those whose birth date has been excluded, and those whose year of birth has been wrongly recorded to give an age at entry of under 10 years.

### Ethnicity

10. The HESA record contains details of each student's ethnic origin, based on information provided by the student to the institution. The groups used are those from the 1991 Census, shown in Table C4.

11. Over 80 per cent of graduates class themselves as 'white', and we considered combining some of the other groups, as they contained relatively small numbers. As the employment rates varied considerably between these groups, it was decided to retain each one separately.

### Social Class/low participation neighbourhoods

12. Here, we used same the breakdown as was used for the access indicators. In both cases this meant taking two defined groups, plus a third group for unknowns. More detailed splits were

investigated, but found not to be helpful enough to warrant the extra variables required.

13. All graduates who were over 21 years of age on entry to higher education were allocated to unknown Social Class. Information from UCAS was used to provide Social Class for graduates who were under 21 on entry. The groups are shown in Table C5.

14. The full definition of low participation neighbourhoods is given in Annex A2 of HEFCE 00/40. The groups are shown in Table C6.

### Degree classification

15. For the indicator excluding those going on to further study, it was agreed that degree classification should be included as a factor in the benchmark. The groups are given in Table C7.

### Sandwich course

16. This variable was a marker to show whether or not the graduate had been on a sandwich course. It took the value 1 for those from a sandwich course, 0 otherwise.

## Institutional factors

### Definition of location

17. One question the FDS asks is the location and postcode of the employment obtained. Using a postcode to Local Authority District (LAD) or Unitary Authority (UA) look-up we can obtain details of the LADs/UAs to which graduates from each institution go for employment. The location of each institution is known, and so for each institution we can list all LADs/UAs in order of their distance from it. The set of areas closest to the institution which contain at least 50 per cent of all the graduates with known job location is then used to define the institution's neighbourhood.

18. We have obtained estimates of the unemployment rates in each LAD/UA using the 1999 annual Labour Force Survey (LFS). The percentage of jobs in each LAD/UA which are at graduate level (see below) have been obtained from the same source. Together with the number of jobs in each area, these allow the unemployment rates and percentages of graduate jobs in each institution's neighbourhood to be calculated.

### Graduate jobs

19. In the study by the Institute for Employment Research, 'Moving on', jobs were classified on the basis of their Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) as graduate jobs, graduate track jobs, and non-graduate jobs. We have used this breakdown to obtain information about the types of job available in an institution's neighbourhood.

20. The factor used in the model is the percentage of jobs in the neighbourhood which are graduate jobs. This gave better discrimination between institutions for the model used than the combined percentage of jobs which were either graduate or graduate track.

21. Table C8 lists the SOC codes that are used to define the three job types.

### Unemployment rate

22. Because the majority of graduates are in their twenties, it was decided to use the unemployment rates among 20-29 year olds in each neighbourhood.

### Average entry scores

23. This variable is calculated for home-domiciled entrants to full-time first degree courses in 1999-2000. It was decided to use the most recent entry data available, rather than take an average over the leaving cohort, who would have entered at different times and possibly with differing entry requirements.

24. The average was taken for all such students who entered with A-levels or Scottish Highers, and for whom number of points was recorded. The following tables show the grade to points conversions used.

**A-levels**

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Points | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |

**AS-levels**

| Grade | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Points | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**Scottish Highers**

| Grade | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Points | 6 | 4 | 2 |

25. The maximum number of points recorded is 30, equivalent to three grade As at A-level, or five grade As at Scottish Highers. The average entry qualification for an institution is therefore an underestimate, in general. For institutions with few point scores recorded, the average score across the sector has been used.

Table C1: **Subject groups**

| | Subject | HESA codes |
|---|---|---|
| A | Medicine, dentistry, veterinary science | A1-A4, D1 |
| B | Pharmacy, Ophthalmics, Nursing, Medical technology | B3, B5, B7, B8 |
| C | Other subjects allied to medicine | B1, B2, B4, B6, B9 |
| D | Biological sciences | C1-C9 |
| E | Agriculture | D2-D4, D8, D9 |
| F | Physical sciences | F1-F9 |
| G | Mathematical sciences | G1-G4, G9 |
| H | Computer science | G5 |
| I | Engineering and technology | H1-H9, J1-J9 |
| J | Architecture, building and planning | K1-K9 |
| K | Economics, Social work, Geography | L1, L5, L8 |
| L | Other Social and Political studies, Law | L3, L4, L6, L7, M1, M3, M9 |
| M | Business and administrative studies | N1-N9 |
| N | Librarianship & information science | P1-P6 |
| O | Languages, Humanities | Q1-Q9, R1-R8, T1-T9, V1-V9 |
| P | Music, Drama | W3, W4 |
| Q | Other Creative arts | W1, W2, W5-W9 |
| R | Education | X1-X9 |
| S | Combined studies | Y1-Y6 |

Table C2: **Entry qualifications**

| Code | Entry qualifications | HESA codes |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | A-levels or Highers, points unknown | QUALENT2=39, 40 |
| 2 | A-levels or Highers, up to 8 points, or Baccalaureate | QUALENT2=39, 40, 47 |
| 3 | A-levels or Highers, 9 to 12 points | QUALENT2=39, 40 |
| 4 | A-levels or Highers, 13 to 18 points | QUALENT2=39, 40 |
| 5 | A-levels or Highers, 19 to 24 points | QUALENT2=39, 40 |
| 6 | A-levels or Highers, 25 points or over | QUALENT2=39, 40 |
| 7 | Access qualification | QUALENT2=29, 43, 48 |
| 8 | BTEC or equivalent | QUALENT2=41 |
| 9 | GNVQ level 3 or above | QUALENT2=40 |
| 10 | Higher education | QUALENT2=01 to 16, 21 to 30 |
| 11 | Other, or not known | QUALENT2=55, 56, 92, 93, 97, 98, 99 |

Table C3: **Age group**

| Code | Age group |
|---|---|
| 1 | Under 21 at entry |
| 2 | Age 21 to 24 at entry |
| 3 | Age 25 or over at entry |
| 4 | Unknown age |

Table C4: **Ethnicity**

| Code | Ethnic group | HESA codes |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | White | ETHNIC=10 |
| 2 | Black Caribbean | ETHNIC=21 |
| 3 | Black African | ETHNIC=22 |
| 4 | Black other | ETHNIC=29 |
| 5 | Indian | ETHNIC=31 |
| 6 | Pakistani | ETHNIC=32 |
| 7 | Bangladeshi | ETHNIC=33 |
| 8 | Chinese | ETHNIC=34 |
| 9 | Asian other | ETHNIC=39 |
| 10 | Other, or unknown | ETHNIC=80, 90, 98, 99 |

Table C5: **Social Class**

| Code | Group |
|---|---|
| 1 | Social Classes I, II and IIIn |
| 2 | Social Classes IIIm, IV and V |
| 3 | Unknown Social Class |

Table C6: **Neighbourhood type**

| Code | Group |
|---|---|
| 1 | Low participation neighbourhood |
| 2 | Neighbourhood that is not low participation |
| 3 | Neighbourhood of unknown type |

Table C7: **Degree classification**

| Code | Degree class |
|---|---|
| 1 | First class honours |
| 2 | Upper second class honours |
| 3 | Lower second class honours, or undivided second class honours |
| 4 | Third class honours |
| 5 | Other classification |

Table C8: **Definition of graduate and graduate track jobs**

| Job type | SOC codes used |
|---|---|
| Graduate | 100 101 102 103 110 111 113 120 123 124 125 126 131 150 151 152 153 154 155 170 176 190 191 200 201 202 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 230 231 232 233 234 235 239 240 241 242 250 251 252 253 260 261 262 270 271 290 291 292 293 3003301 302 303 304 310 311 312 313 320 331 340 341 342 343 344 347 348 350 360 361 362 363 364 480 381 382 383 384 390 392 394 395 396 399 |
| Graduate track | 112 121 122 127 130 132 139 140 141 142 160 169 171 172 173 174 175 177 178 179 199 309 330 332 345 346 349 370 371 385 386 387 391 393 400 401 410 420 421 450 463 491 511 512 513 515 516 517 518 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 529 532 534 540 541 543 556 560 561 570 571 573 592 593 598 610 611 612 613 642 643 650 660 661 700 701 702 703 710 719 790 791 864 893 904 |
| Non-graduate | 411 412 430 440 441 451 452 459 460 461 462 490 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 509 510 514 519 530 531 533 535 536 537 542 544 550 551 552 553 554 555 557 559 562 563 569 573 579 580 581 582 590 591 594 595 596 597 599 614 615 619 620 621 622 630 631 640 641 644 651 652 659 670 671 672 673 690 691 699 720 721 722 730 731 732 733 792 800 801 802 809 810 811 812 813 814 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 829 830 831 832 833 834 839 840 841 842 843 844 850 851 859 860 861 862 863 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 889 890 891 892 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 910 911 912 913 919 920 921 922 923 924 929 930 931 932 933 934 940 941 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 990 999 |

# Annex D

## Membership of Performance Indicators Steering Group

1. The Performance Indicators Steering Group (PISG) was set up in March 1998, with members representing the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), HM Treasury, HESA, the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (now Universities UK), the Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP), the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW). The Scottish Higher Education Funding Council (SHEFC) originally sent an observer, but subsequently became a full member of the group. The Higher Education Management Statistics group (HEMS) send an observer. Papers are sent to both the Welsh Office and the Department of Higher and Further Education, Training and Employment (DHFETE) in Northern Ireland.

2. A number of other bodies were later invited to join the group. The steering group now also includes members from the National Union of Students (NUS), Committee of Scottish Higher Education Principals (now Universities Scotland), Universities and Colleges Admissions Services (UCAS), Office of Science and Technology (OST) and the Department of Health (DH). In addition, the sub-group formed to consider employment indicators includes representatives from the Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS) and the Careers Service Unit (CSU).

3. The following are the current members representing these bodies on the steering group and on the sub-group.

### Membership of PISG

| | |
|---|---|
| Bahram Bekhradnia (Chairman) | HEFCE |
| Patricia Ambrose | SCOP |
| Carole Barrington | HESA |
| Linda Bradley | DHFETE |
| Tony Bruce | Universities UK |
| Michael Davidson | DfEE |
| Reg DeMellow | SHEFC |
| Frances Good | HEFCW |
| Jeremy Taylor | HM Treasury |
| Sofija Opacic | NUS |
| Tony Higgins | UCAS |
| Michael Hipkins | DfEE |
| Ben Newbound | OST |
| Jane Wild | HESA |
| Professor Joan Stringer | Universities Scotland |
| Marian Taylor | DH |
| John Thompson | HEFCE |
| David Young | Universities UK |
| David Wann | SHEFC |
| Professor Robin Sibson | HEMS |
| Judy Akinbolu (Secretary) | HEFCE |

### Membership of employment sub-group

| | |
|---|---|
| Bahram Bekhradnia (Chairman) | HEFCE |
| Carole Barrington | HESA |
| Mary McAleese | DfEE |
| Michael Davidson | DfEE |
| Frances Good | HEFCW |
| Jeremy Taylor | HM Treasury |
| Mike Hill | CSU |
| Michael Hipkins | DfEE |
| Anne-Marie Martin | AGCAS |
| Graeme Rosenberg | HEFCE |
| Professor Robin Sibson | HEMS |
| John Thompson | HEFCE |
| Judy Akinbolu (Secretary) | HEFCE |

Higher Education Funding Council for England
Northavon House
Coldharbour Lane
BRISTOL
BS16 1QD

tel 0117 931 7317
fax 0117 931 7203
www.hefce.ac.uk

BEST COPY AVAILABLE